

Comptroller General of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

437287

Decision

Matter of:

Vorum Research Corporation--Reconsideration

File:

B-255393.2; B-255394.2

Date:

August 8, 1994

DECISION

Vorum Research Corporation requests that we reconsider our decision, Vorum Research Corp., B-255393; B-255394, Feb. 28, 1994, 94-1 CPD \P 155, denying its protests against the terms of requests for quotation Nos. M6-Q26-93 and M6-Q27-93, issued by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for training and communications software associated with the agency's decision to extend to additional VA medical centers the use of Shapemaker software for the automated fabrication of mobility aids (AFMA).

We deny the request for reconsideration.

In 1985, the VA began a program to use computers to aid in the design and fabrication of artificial limbs. As part of this program, the agency funded development of a software package known as Shapemaker. The Shapemaker software is presently in use at five VA orthotic laboratories, and was designed for use on Apple Macintosh personal computers.

In 1993, VA decided to expand the program to an additional 12 host sites and 23 remote client sites; as a consequence, the agency identified needs for training on the Shapemaker software and for communication software to transfer data between sites. The agency then issued RFQ No. M6-Q26-93, for training support, and RFQ No. M6-Q27-93, to provide software compatible with Shapemaker software for "communication between [h]ost and [c]lient AFMA facilities employing Shapemaker software and Apple Macintosh Centris 650 computers."

Vorum submitted proposals in response to both solicitations, offering a free copy of CANFIT-PLUS software and offering to provide training in the use of that software to meet the needs of RFQ No. M6-Q26-93. In response to RFQ No. M6-Q27-93, Vorum offered to bundle communications software with a functioning version of CANFIT-PLUS. The protester acknowledged that CANFIT-PLUS would not operate on the VA's Macintosh computers, but suggested that VA could

save money by purchasing IBM-compatible computers, for which CANFIT-PLUS was designed. The agency rejected both proposals as unacceptable, and these protests followed.

In our prior decision, we noted that regardless of Vorum's arguments that use of CANFIT-PLUS would ultimately be cheaper than continued use of Shapemaker, the procurements at issue were not for the purchase of software but for training on the software already purchased and for compatible communications software. Vorum conceded that the communications software it offered in response to RFQ No. M6-Q27-93 was not compatible with Shapemaker as required by that solicitation, nor did Vorum offer training on Shapemaker; rather, it proposed the use of different software for which it would provide training. The record therefore supported the VA's determination that Vorum did not meet the needs stated in the solicitation, and the decision to reject the Vorum proposals was therefore reasonable.

In requesting reconsideration, Vorum contends that regardless of the technical acceptability of its proposal, its price was low and that our Office failed to consider language in the solicitation stating that award would be made to the offeror proposing the lowest price. In so arguing, Vorum ignores the solicitation language, which provides in both instances for award to the offeror proposing the lowest price "meeting the requirements of the solicitation." Since Vorum concedes that its proposal did not meet the solicitation requirements, the award clearly was consistent with the stated award criteria and the decision to reject Vorum's proposal was proper.

The request for reconsideration is denied.

Robert P. Murphy
Acting General Counsel

B-255393.2; B-255394.2